



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Vienna in 1848, Metternich was overthrown. Revolutions extended elsewhere—in France, in Germany. In 1849 Europeans landed in America at the rate of 1,000 a day. A series of wars began with the Crimean struggle in 1853,—Balkan, Chinese, French-Austrian, Italian, Moor-Spanish, American Civil, French-Mexican, Prussian-Danish, Prussian-Austrian, French-Prussian, Russian-Turkish, *et ad nauseum*. Other crises followed upon each other with increasing danger—in Egypt, at Fashoda, in 1898; in Morocco in 1905; in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1909; in Agadir in 1911. Then came the Turkish-Italian war in 1911, followed by the two Balkan wars in 1912-13. Then, 1914. The Congress of Vienna and the Holy Alliance proved to be poisonous remedies.

Besides alliances, leagues, and concerts, Europe has suffered from a division of alliances.

In 1879 Germany and Austria formed an alliance by the terms of a treaty which was not published until 1888. In the meantime—in 1883, to be exact—Italy was admitted. Offsetting this Triple Alliance, France and Russia signed a treaty of alliance in 1891, to be joined later by England, now known as the Triple Entente. This balancing of power between the Alliance and the Entente, as in the case of the quadruple alliance of 1815, maintained a kind of peace for a quarter of a century; but Europe, as we now know, had simply moved from one volcano to another. When the explosion came it was called the World War.

Evidently unmindful of the fate of previous leagues to enforce peace, men in Paris developed a psychology similar to that of Alexander I of a hundred years before. Once again the big powers proposed to organize themselves for the control of the small. Once again it was proposed to set up a small group of men from the powerful States with the power to control the foreign policies of the less powerful. Once again, the world having been reparceled as a result of barter and intrigue, it was proposed to seal the security of the new spoils by the organization of a military league, or at least a league backed by military force. As a result, quite in conformity with the previous league, new dangers have been engendered.

Alongside the attempts to set up coercive leagues, there has developed a policy of complete isolation, especially within the newly created States, following the war. The multiplication of boundaries, with the new customs regulations, has ended often in violations of the simplest economic laws. All of the troubles in Europe are man-made. Nature smiles there as beneficently as ever. The bankruptcy of the majority of European States is due to short-sighted economic behavior backed

by a shorter-sighted politics. The disposition on the part of each nation to grab for food, shelter, clothing, and other necessities, such as oil, not to mention the thirst for glory, has ended in worse than an economic stalemate. The attempt of each State to isolate itself, to constitute itself a sort of league to enforce peace, has ended in an European Donneybrook Fair. Naturally, this faith in the philosophy of isolation carries with it the insistence of each State to be judge in its own case. This makes any mutual consent or common policy impossible.

In the meantime there are reactions in every direction—up, down, sidewise—Tories overthrowing the government in England, the Fascisti staging a successful *coup d'état* in Italy, Ireland boiling in civil war, the Wirt Government falling in Germany, a government surviving suspended only by the slenderest thread in Austria, internal behavior severing all friendships formerly enjoyed by Russia, repudiation and financial collapse staring them all in the face.

The old-fashioned and poisonous remedies of leagues to enforce peace, of alliances, of balanced powers, of each for himself, have not only proved ineffective, they have poisoned the very life blood of Europe.

EUROPEANS FAIL TO UNDERSTAND

EUROPE, once again if we may speak of Europe as an entity, seems strangely uninformed in the basic things at the heart of any enduring peace between States.

She seems incapable, for example, of overcoming economically destructive forces with the healing forms of economic co-operation. When, in the early years of the 19th century, the many German principalities, each with its separate custom-house, were found to stand in the way of German commercial development, the practical organizing German mind met the situation by establishing in 1834 a customs union, familiarly known as the *Zollverein*, with the result that some seventeen German States, joined later by six others, developed their economic life by leaps and bounds. The *Zollverein* was not only the beginning of a successful German economic unity, it was the foundation of the German Empire. Europe seems to have no realizing sense of the importance of that lesson.

As we like to remind ourselves, the rather successful union of free, sovereign, independent States, familiarly known as the United States of America, represents in itself a balance between two opposing forces. One tendency with us is toward the freedom of the nation's parts, individualism—a philosophy which, if practiced

to its logical conclusion, would throw us head on to the rocks of anarchy. This is the Greek in our national life, represented in the main by the Democratic Party. Our other tendency is emphasis on the importance of a strong central government, of centralization, of bureaucracy, of one-man power—an outgrowth of a political theory which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would dump us on the rocks of tyranny. This movement is represented in the main by our Republican Party. Happily, because of a hard-headed sense of balance between these opposing forces, the United States has gone to ruin on neither of these lee shores of politics. Unfortunately, Europe has not learned how to steer her way between anarchy and tyranny.

Europe can have no peace so long as the big powers insist upon dictating to the small. In 1886 the big powers of Europe compelled Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece to disarm; but they armed themselves again. The compulsions of military force are as apt to net more evil than good. The little States will be content to be controlled by the guns of the more powerful, but only until, by hook or crook, they can get from under. The large States exist. The small States are also facts. The small States are in the majority. The large States will not consent to be controlled by the small. The small States will not endure to be controlled by the large. When it was pointed out in the Federal Convention of 1787, meeting in Philadelphia, that it would not be just to allow Virginia, sixteen times larger than Delaware, an equal vote only, it was replied that it would not be safe for Delaware to allow Virginia sixteen times as many votes. The question of "representation" has always been a difficult one; but in our Union we established a satisfactory balance between our large and small States. Europe does not seem to be able to profit by our example.

As it is necessary for Europe to achieve a balance between anarchy and tyranny, between her large and her small States, so it is similarly essential that she should establish a balance between her theories of unalienable rights and her equally unalienable duties. If there is to be any European peace, each European State, insisting upon its right to existence, must balance that right by its correlative duty to observe and to respect the similar right in the case of every other State. Every European State that insists upon its right to independence and happiness must remember its correlative duty to observe and to protect that right in the case of all others.

Every European State demanding the right to equality before the law, and of course every State must be equal before the law, has a correlative duty to observe that right in the case of its sister States. Every sovereign

State has a right to its territory and to jurisdiction over its territory, but it is the correlative duty of each State possessed of such right to observe the same right in the case of every other State. Just as in the case of an individual it is his right to respect and to protection in that right, but only so long as he observes the correlative duty to respect other individuals, so the State that demands the right to respect and to protection in that right has the correlative duty to do unto others as it would they do unto itself. Every European State, if aggrieved, should be entitled to a hearing under the law. It has a right to insist upon that right only so long as it observes the correlative duty to grant a similar right to every other nation. European States have yet to understand and adopt these elementary principles.

Europe seems to be incapable of distinguishing between a government of laws and a government of men. Perhaps this is her most serious and injurious defect. It seemed perfectly natural for her representatives at Paris to set up an organization of men and to give to those men the power to dictate foreign policies of States, especially so long as these men from the larger powers were in the majority. While within individual States—England, Switzerland, France, and others—individual liberty is established under the rule of law, the society of European States seem to have little capacity for profiting by that experience. With us there are two familiar axioms of government, elementary and elemental: one is that governments can derive their just powers only from the consent of the governed; the other is that successful government must be a government of laws and not of men. Europe as Europe seems to have learned neither of these.

It ought not to seem strange to Europe that the United States, confronted by these facts, stands aloof. Yet Europe complains of our absence from her councils. As Castlereagh, referring to the Protocol of Troppau, plainly said that Britain could never agree to a principle which she would not in any circumstances allow to be applied in her own case; so the United States will in time of peace and in the name of peace grant to no mere group of men the power to coerce other States for the simple reason that our country would not and ought not grant to such a group of men legislative or executive power to coerce the United States. No big power will submit vital interests to phrase-makers or a mere group of men. The United States will neither agree in advance to go to war in situations now impossible to forecast to take sides in European quarrels, nor to threaten or dictate to Europe. Mr. Hughes, speaking in Boston October 30, voiced the historic position of this country when he said: "There is no reason why we should fritter

away our helpful influence by becoming a partisan of either party in such controversies, much less make the fatal mistake of attempting to assume the rôle of dictator."

Surely, Europe has no reason for misunderstanding the United States. If Europe were to go about the business of setting up, under the principle of the consent of the governed, a government of laws and not of men, the United States would not hold aloof. With all the divergent interests peculiar to the European complex, such a work will not be easy. It certainly cannot be accomplished at once. But to make a beginning is imperative. If only the language of European statesmanship could be tuned to such a course, it could not fail to strike a responsive chord in the heart of America.

IN BEHALF OF GOETHE

THE GOETHE relics lent by the Goethe Museum of Frankfort, Germany, to the city of Lyons, France, for purposes of an international exhibition are not to be sold at auction.

It appears that in 1914 the city of Lyons organized an international exhibition. In April of that year the French committee requested the authorities of the Goethe Museum in Frankfort to arrange for a special "Goethe Pavilion" in the German Building which the city had erected for German exhibitors. The French committee naturally assured the museum that the Goethe relics would be transported from and back to Frankfort free of charge. The invitation was accepted, and the pavilion, erected as planned, was filled with the relics of Goethe and his time, the primary object being to picture Goethe's life and doings. Among the relics was an oil portrait by Kolbe, the complete original Weimar edition of Goethe, the two original French and German illustrations of Goethe's "Faust" and "Iphigenie" by Delacroix and Kreling. There were a number of letters and papers written by Goethe himself. As a result, the Goethe pavilion became the center of no little interest. But the war came while the exhibition was in full swing.

In the early days of the struggle the directors of the Goethe Museum in Frankfort, through the mediation of German professors in Switzerland, sent an inquiry to the mayor of Lyons. They received an answer fully assuring them that the relics would be carefully guarded. Later in the war, renewing their inquiries, they were informed that the German exhibition had been seized by the government. Since the war private persons and diplomatic representatives in Paris have attempted to get the Goethe souvenirs returned. The President of the French Republic announced that, so far as France is concerned, the articles may be returned, but it devel-

oped that the German exhibitors were confronted with a bill for storage amounting to 500,000 francs. The Germans replied that because of the depreciation of the German mark, if for no other reason, they were unable to pay this amount. Then it was that the authorities at Lyons announced that the Goethe relics would be sold at auction on October 28.

Learning of these facts, the American Peace Society sent the story to various persons, including friends in France, fully convinced that if the French people were informed of this impending injustice the sale would be forbidden and the priceless relics restored. The French, like the rest of us, recognize the fact that there are values above the quarrels of nations. They recognize the priceless contributions from the poets and teachers of men, especially the gifts from Goethe. Our French friends, therefore, will join with the rest of the world in welcoming the news that the relics are not to be sold at auction. We have no doubt that a way will be found for returning these invaluable memorials to the museum in Frankfort.

THE CENTRAL AMERICAN CONFERENCE

THREE can be no doubt of our country's faith in the method of international conference as a means of promoting peace between States. The latest evidence of our country's interest is its instructions, under date of October 21, to our legations in the five Central American republics to extend an invitation to these republics to send plenipotentiaries to Washington for a conference to be held beginning Monday, December 4. The invitation has been accepted. The proposed self-explanatory agenda of the conference is as follows:

"1. The negotiation of a treaty or treaties to make effective those provisions of the treaties signed at Washington on December 20, 1907, which experience has shown to be effective in maintaining friendly relations and co-operation among the Central American States.

"2. Measures whereby, in view of the achievements accomplished with regard to the limitation of armaments by the powers participating in the Conference at Washington in 1921, the Central American States may carry on this endeavor and set an example to the world, and, above all, to the powers of this hemisphere, by adopting effective measures for the limitation of armaments in Central America.

"3. The working out of a plan for setting up tribunals of inquiry whenever any disputes or questions regarding the proposed treaty or treaties, which cannot be settled by diplomatic means, shall unfortunately arise between any two or more of the countries.

"4. Any other questions which the countries represented at the conference unanimously desire to consider."

It has been fifteen years since the signing of the general treaty of peace and amity in Washington, De-